

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI G.S. SINGHVI

AND

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.Y. SOMAYAJULU

Writ Petition No.25254 of 2005

-

-

-

Between:

Kollam Ratnam ... Petitioner

And

The Government of India, Ministry of Petroleum

And Natural Gas, New Delhi rep. by its Joint Secretary

And three others.

... Respondents

-

-

:: ORDER::

-

Counsel for Petitioners : Sri V.H.V.R.R. Swamy

Counsel for Respondent No.1 : Mr.A. Rajasekhar Reddy,

Asst. Solicitor General of India.

-

-

-

December 05, 2005

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

per G.S. Singhvi, CJ

The petitioner who claims to be a public representative has filed this petition for quashing “Jan Kerosene Pariyojana” introduced by the Government of India for strengthening the PDS kerosene distribution network throughout the country.

The petitioner has averred that the implementation of “Jan Kerosene Pariyojana” will not in any manner benefit the consumers. Rather it would adversely affect the supply of kerosene to the consumers. According to him, as a sequel to the introduction of new scheme the middlemen would be benefited at the cost of the consumers and, therefore, the new policy is liable to be quashed.

We have heard Sri V.H.V.R.R. Swamy, learned counsel for the petitioner and carefully perused the averments contained in the writ petition and the contents of Circular dated 11-8-2005 issued by the Government of India, Ministry of

Petroleum and Natural Gas, and Memo dated 29-9-2005 issued by the Government of Andhra Pradesh for implementation of the policy framed by the Government of India and are convinced that the grievance made by the petitioner in the name of public interest is illusory and totally ill-conceived.

The petitioner has not placed any iota of evidence before the Court to show that as a sequel to the implementation of “Jan Kerosene Pariyojana” the people of Village Srikrishnapatnam, Rajanagaram Mandal have been adversely affected. It is also not shown to have made any representation to any authority about the so-called shortage in the supply of kerosene under “Jan Kerosene Pariyojana”. It is therefore reasonable to infer that this petition has been filed by the petitioner not in public interest but only for the sake of publicity and we do not have any valid ground to entertain his prayer.

For the reasons stated above, the Writ Petition is dismissed.

G.S. SINGHVI, CJ

C.Y. SOMAYAJULU, J

5th December, 2005

svs/vtv